

Serial No. **09/989,462**

Docket No. **K-0348**

Amendment dated April 25, 2006

Reply to Office Action of December 28, 2005

REMARKS

Entry of the amended claims is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (1) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (2) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration (since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution without incorporating additional subject matter); (3) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; and/or (4) place the application in better form for appeal (if necessary). Entry is thus requested.

By the present response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 11, 12 and 17 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17-20 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph. In this regard, the Examiner asserts that the newly added limitations “a switching part for superimposing the video signal from the first video processing part and the video signal from the adjusting part according to the control signal from the control part, by replacing bits of the video

signal from the first video processing part in reverse order of significance level thereof with the video signal bits presented from the adjusting part” contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant submits that these limitations are fully supported by Applicant’s specification and drawings. Figure 2 clearly shows the switching part 30, a first video processing part 10, a second video processing part 20, an adjusting part 30, and a control part 40 as well as a switching part 50. This is further supported by the description in paragraph 15 on page 4. Moreover, according to embodiments of the present invention, a given number of bits of the video signal from the second video processing part are selected in the adjusting part and presented in order of significance level thereof. In other words, the most significant bit (MSB) of the video signal is presented first. This is supported in Applicant’s disclosure on page 5, paragraph 21. Further, according to embodiments of the present invention, the video signal from the first video processing part and the video signal from the adjusting part are superimposed by adding bits of the video signal from the first video processing part in reverse order of significance level thereof with the video signal bits presented from the adjusting part. In other words, bits of the first video processing part are added starting with the least significant bit (LSB) with the video signal bits presented from the adjusting part. This is fully supported and disclosed in Applicant’s

Serial No. **09/989,462**

Docket No. **K-0348**

Amendment dated April 25, 2006

Reply to Office Action of December 28, 2005

specification on page 6, paragraphs 23 and 24. Paragraph 23 clearly states that “the superimposition of the main data and the subdata starts from the LSB (Least Significant Bit) on a main data line . . .” and thus, fully supports these limitations in the claims of the present application.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the limitations in the claims of the present application are fully supported by Applicant’s specification and drawings. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be examined in view of arguments submitted in Applicant’s previously filed response filed October 3, 2005.

Serial No. **09/989,462**

Docket No. **K-0348**

Amendment dated April 25, 2006

Reply to Office Action of December 28, 2005

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-4, 7-14 and 17-20 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg

Date: April 25, 2006

\\fk4\Documents\2016\2016-094\85182.doc

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

\\fk4\Documents\2016\2016-094\85182.doc